



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*AI OR THE CITY?* JOSHUA 8. 12, 16

BY MAX L. MARGOLIS, Dropsie College.

BAER prints in both verses עֵי *city* in the text (ketib) and עַי *Ai* in the margin (kere), while Ginsburg has עִיר without a marginal correction (hence עַר ketib u-kere). On 8. 13 Baer tells us that in Codex Reuchlinianus 2 there is a note, עַי פָּלֶג, 'there is a division of opinion as to the reading עַי', and in the List of Differences between Occidentals and Orientals he adduces from the same codex the statement that the Occidentals write and read עַי twice in this verse (תְּרוּיָהָן דְּפָסָק), while the Orientals write עִיר but read עַי. Baer adds the remark that the printed Masoretic note is inaccurate, for which reason Norzi was unable to straighten out the difficulty. The printed Masorah (end of volume IV in the editio princeps, Bamberg, 1524-5) has it, namely, that the difference between the two schools concerns not the two instances in verse 13 (תְּרוּיָהָן דְּפָסָק), but two different verses (ב' פָּסָקֵין), i.e. verses 12 and 16. Norzi's note on verse 12 reads thus: 'The codices and the Masorahs vary. In some we find it written לעִיר and read לעַי, the author of כלֵי יָקָר (Samuel Luniado or Laniado) agreeing, while others write and read לעַר. The same variation obtains in verse 16. In the latter instance בעַי is found so written and read in an ancient codex. The Targum reads עַי in verse 12, while in verse 16 it has the doublet: "in the city, in Ai"; hence is found in verse 12 עַי with no marginal variant, while in verse 16, finding שַׁר in the text and עַי in the margin, it combined both in the

translation. Kimhi on verse 16 explicitly states that שָׁיר is the textual and שְׁיָר the marginal reading, but he is silent on verse 12. In the Masorah Magna we find s.v. שְׁיָר two conflicting notes: (1) שְׁיָר is the textual reading (against the margin שָׁיר) in verses 12 and 16; (2) שְׁיָר is the reading in verses 9 and 11, but שָׁיר in 12 and 13.<sup>1</sup> Norzi then quotes the statement of the Masorah Finalis concerning the difference between the two schools, adding that it is not clear which instance is referred to.

Ginsburg gives in the first volume of his *The Massorah compiled from Manuscripts*, p. 592, a List of the differences between Occidentals and Orientals in Joshua, which, according to the English volume, p. 415, is based, in addition to the printed material, on the following manuscripts: St. Petersburg Codex of A.D. 1009, Arund. Orient. 16, Add. 15,251, and Codex Merzbacher. All of these but the first, in which the item is altogether admitted, agree with the wording of the printed Masorah to the effect that the difference as to שְׁיָר and שָׁיר concerns two distinct verses. Moreover, Ginsburg found in Codex No. 1-3 of the Paris National Library explicit Masoretic notes on verses 12 and 16, according to which in both places שְׁיָר is the marginal reading of the Orientals, while the Occidentals write and read שָׁיר.

In his *Introduction to the Massoretico-critical Edition*, 208-10, the same scholar avers that as regards verse 13 Baer's avowal of a variation between the two schools is substantiated 'by no official Lists, MSS., Massorahs, or early editions'. 'Both the MSS. and the Lists which exhibit any variation at all, not only mark it on שָׁיר of the city in verse 12, but vary in their statements as to the nature of the difference and as to the school to which

it belongs. This will be seen from the following analysis of the Massorah Parva: (1) Orient. 2201, which is dated A.D. 1246, and Harley 1528, have in the text in 8. 12 *לעִיר* of the city, and in the margin against it *'לְעִיר ק'* the *Keri* is of *Ai*. The same is the case in Harley 5710–11, where the Massorah Parva has against this verse *לְעִיר רָשֶׁת לְלָמֶד* the *Resh* is to be cancelled = the *Keri* is *לְעִיר* of *Ai*, thus treating it as an ordinary *Keri* of the Western school. (2) Arund. Orient. 16 and Add. 15,451, which are superb manuscripts, have no *Keri* at all, but simply remark against it in verse 12 *ר' דַמְשֻׁע' four times misleading*, which is the condemnatory appellation for *Sevirin*. Ginsburg proceeds with the evidence from the Lists (see above), and pointedly concludes: ‘Having altered *תְרוּיוֹן דְפָסָק* in *two verses*, into *ב' פְסָקוֹן* in both clauses of the verse, Dr. Baer was obliged to palm it on verse 13, since it is the only verse in this section where *לְעִיר* of the city occurs twice.’

In volume III of Ginsburg’s great compilation, p. 145, in the List of *חלופים*, i. e. of textual elements which must be guarded against levelling, we find :

מים <i>לְעִיר</i> ב <u>תוֹךְ</u> ה <u>עֵמֶק</u>	קְרָמָאָה
מים <i>לְעִיר ס"ג</i>	תְנִינָא
מים <i>לְעִיר ב<u>תוֹךְ</u> ה<u>עֵמֶק</u></i>	תְלִיתָאָה

The *סֶפֶק פְסָק* (= end of the verse) leaves no doubt that verse 12 is referred to in the middle instance. The same statement is found *ibid.*, p. 310 (from the *Tzufut Kale Masorah*), minus the identifying remark *ס"ג*. Accordingly, the reading *לְעִיר* of the city is presupposed in verse 12. To the same purport is the note against verse 12 in the printed *Massorah Parva*: *בָן כְתִיב וּקְרִי מִכְחָמָס*, the reading in the *editio princeps* (see above) being *לְעִיר* (see Ginsburg,

*Introduction*, p. 210).<sup>1</sup> מס"ה stands for מסורה הנודלה, *Masorah Magna*, according to Elias Levita, *Massoreth ha-massoreth*, ed. Ginsburg, p. 249. ? מפָחַ=מִנְחָה Frensdorff, *Massoretisches Wörterbuch*, p. 18 of the German, attempts no identification of the unusual formula. But is perfectly clear: write and read לְעֵיר. In the Yemenite Masorah (Ginsburg, *The Massorah*, III, 68) the following statement may be read:

מִים לְעֵיר וּקְרֵי בְּכָל הַתִּינָאָן וְהַיְרוֹשָׁלָמִים וּבְכָבֵב בְּמִסּוּדָת כְּדֵד נְדוּל מְבָחוֹן שֶׁבַן צְלָל קְרֵי וּכְתָב [בְּמִכְחָה יְעוֹשָׁשׁ וְדֹלָא בְּקַצְתָּא דְּפָסִים דְּכַתִּי] לְעֵיר וּקְרֵי לְעֵי וּנְם הַתְּרָנוּם לְקַרְתָּא מְבוֹחָה דְּנוֹרָסִי בְּקַרְאָה לְעֵיר וּנְם הַשְּׁרָיוֹשׁוֹ לְעֵיר. Apparently misled by the reference to the Targumic rendering of *the city*, Ginsburg refers this note to verse 13, the rendering in our Targum editions in verse 12 being לְעֵי (see Ginsburg, *Introduction*, p. 210); but the Yemenite Targum, ed. Praetorius, has there לְקַרְתָּא, and it is obvious that the note refers to verse 12 (hence at the beginning לְעֵיר is mispointed; point לְעֵיר?). Now this note says clearly that לְעֵיר of *the city* is the reading (not only the writing) in all the codices (of Yemen) and in those of Jerusalem. The author goes on to quote the note in the printed *Masorah Parva* (see above); he repudiates those codices which have לְעֵיר in the text and לְעֵי in the margin, and concludes with a reference to the Targum and to the *editio princeps* of the Hebrew Concordance. The reading and pointing לְעֵיר of *the city*, would thus seem to be substantiated as the approved, and certainly as the Western reading. As is well known, we in the West follow the

<sup>1</sup> [Since writing this, I have been able to inspect the *editio princeps* in the private library of the Hon. Mayer Sulzberger, of Philadelphia. The text reads לְעֵיר. Accordingly, in the Yemenite Masorah the pointing is correct, as far as it goes. Nevertheless it remains true that the author of that Masorah rejects the *kere* לְעֵי! I must admit that the reading (pointing) in Jacob ben Haim's text and the accompanying masoretic note are a puzzle.]

Palestinian school of Masoretes, and Kimhi's silence in verse 12 (see above) may be tantamount to supporting לְעִיר of the city.

It is to be regretted that the note in Codex Reuchlinianus 2 cannot be verified at the present moment and at this distance. How sorely we are indeed in need of photographic reproductions of important biblical manuscripts, whether in the original or in translation, in the securing of which the universities and colleges of this country should be willing to co-operate! Nevertheless, I am loth to go to the length of doubting Baer's veracity, as Ginsburg so unceremoniously does. The Targum, as has been observed, goes normally with the Orientals; accordingly, the reading לְעִיר in verse 12 might be Oriental. Once we resort to an ancient version as a fulcrum of the received text, we must needs consult all. The Vulgate has 'ex occidentali parte eiusdem civitatis'; that may be a free paraphrase by the translator, or his Hebrew had לְעִיר. Most likely, however, Jerome followed Symmachus, who, on the authority of a gloss in the Syrohexaplaris (ed. Lagarde), wrote حَدَّدَتْ لَمَّا دَعَتْ مَلَكُوتَكَوْنِي. Symmachus apparently read לְעִיר. Conversely, Origen supports the reading לְעִיר. In the opening pages of the New Series of this REVIEW (p. 20 f.) I pointed out how for the purposes of establishing what is the Masoretic text recourse must be had to Origen's Hexapla, and in vol. III, pp. 323 ff., I gave an illustration for Joshua 7. 17. Now another example presents itself. How the original Greek translator has dealt with chapter 8 (as with other portions of the book), removing incongruities arising out of the combination of double accounts in the Hebrew, and accomplishing it, if needs be, by violent condensation, has been pointed out by Wellhausen (*Composition*,

1889, p. 126). Verses 11 b, 12, 13 are reduced in the Septuagint to the small compass: ἀπ' ἀνατολῶν καὶ τὰ ἔνεδρα τῆς πόλεως ἀπὸ θαλάσσης. Origen, as was his wont, retained this complex, at the same time marking it with the obelus as something unwarranted by the Hebrew; whereupon he introduced *sub asterisco* a fresh translation of the verses in question which reads as follows: καὶ παρενέβαλον ἀπὸ βορρᾶ τῆς Γαὶ καὶ ἡ κοιλὰς ἀνάμεσον αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς Γαὶ 12 καὶ ἔλαβεν ὡς πέντε χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν καὶ ἔθετο αὐτοὺς ἔνεδρον ἀνάμεσον τῆς Βηθανίας καὶ τῆς Γαὶ θάλασσαν τῆς Γαὶ 13 καὶ ἔταξαν ὁ λαὸς τὴν πᾶσαν παρεμβολὴν ἡ ἦν ἀπὸ βορρᾶ τῇ πόλει καὶ τὰ ἐσχατα αὐτοῦ θάλασσαν τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐπορεύθη Ἰησοῦς τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς κοιλάδος. Verses 15 b, 16 a, omitted in the Septuagint, were likewise supplied by Origen *sub asterisco*: καὶ ἔφυγον ὁδὸν τῆς ἐρήμου 16 καὶ ἐνίσχυσεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τῆς Γαι τοῦ διώξαι ὅπισσα αὐτῶν. Here again Origen, or rather his source (probably Theodotion), supports the reading בַּע. All, however, that we really may say is this, that the reading יְלִי in verse 12, attributed by certain authorities to the Orientals, was current in the third and second centuries. It is interesting to note that in the same verse Origen again ranges himself on the side of the Orientals (*ketib*) with his *Βηθανία* נִינֵּה against בֵּית אֶל of the Occidentals (see the official Lists referred to above). In 19. 38 we have another instance where Origen agrees with the Oriental *ketib*: ὠραμ מֹרֶה against חֲרֵם, the Oriental *kere* which is the textual reading of the Occidentals. Elsewhere Origen supports the Occidental text; in a few instances the rendering is too inexact to admit of conclusive evidence. All that can be said is that the differences between the two schools ascend to ancient times, and testify to a fluctuation

of the text in the centuries antecedent to the split between Orientals and Occidentals. The similarity of יְעֵד and עֵד accounts for the confusion. In 15. 9 Theodotion misread יְעֵד into עֵד; on the other hand, the Septuagint read הַעֲדִי for עֵד 7. 3; 8. 18, 28. Just as in the Hebrew יְעֵד and עֵד were liable to confusion, so in the Greek γαῖος and γῆ(ν) were interchanged. Thus we find γαῖος for γῆν 2. 1 (the sigla are those in my forthcoming edition of the Greek Joshua) *rrosccaa<sub>2</sub>*; 7. 2 B C E S adj<sup>supraser</sup>k (cf. γαῖος with accus. ending *f*, and the doublet τὴν γῆν γαῖον); conversely γῆν for γαῖος 7. 2 sec lptiz (cf. the doublet γῆν γαῖον A); γῆς for γαῖος 8. 16 E n M<sup>mg</sup> n<sup>mg</sup>. Greek γαῖος is also the transliteration of Hebrew (אֶתְהָ); cf. Josh. 18. 16, where the Syrohexaplaris writes אֶתְהָ; it is quite plausible that Greek γῆς for Hebrew אֶתְהָ 15. 8 is an error for γαῖος representing the synonymous αῖος. Still a further confusion of יְעֵד and עֵד may be cited from the Greek in 2 Chron. 32. 6, where τῆς φαραγγός (Lucian alone reverts to the Hebrew τῆς πολεώς) is a translation of τῆς γαῖος=הַעֲדִי for הַעֲדִי, γαῖος being misconceived as the equivalent of αῖος. We shall certainly not burden the original translator with ascribing a gate to a ravine! On the other hand, he was not sagacious enough to realize that עֵד in his Hebrew copy was a blunder for יְעֵד. In the language of the author of the *Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments*, the mark of abbreviation had faded away. Conversely, the appearance of a pen-scratch resembling a mark of abbreviation has led to the expansion of עֵד to יְעֵד. Where, as in chapter 8 of Joshua, either reading made sense, the confusion was a natural one. The 'tradition which our fathers have handed down to us' is, alas, often but a scribe's subjective reasoning coupled with a blurred vision.